

RECEIVED
MAR 26 2011
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1800
respectfully direct the attention of the Examiner to claim 1, line nine, which recites in part
“means for generating an error signal, said error signal”, and line 20 “means for generating a
differential error signal, said differential error signal”. (*Emphasis Added*). Applicants submit
that the above-quoted language from claim 1 provides appropriate antecedent basis for the
5 limitations of an “error signal” and a “differential error signal” in claim 1 and in all claims
depending therefrom.

Applicants further direct the attention of the Examiner to claim 9, line 11, which recites
in part “further comparing said output voltage to a reference voltage to thereby determine an
error signal” and line 12 which recites in part “comparing each said differential channel current
10 signal to said error signal to thereby determine a respective differential error signal”. (*Emphasis*
Added). Thus, Applicants submit that claim 9 also provides appropriate antecedent basis for the
limitations of an “error signal” and a “differential error signal” in claim 9 and in all claims
depending therefrom.

The Examiner states that at least two error signals were recited in the claims, and that it is
15 unclear which error signal is being referenced. Applicants respectfully direct the attention of the
Examiner to the above-quoted language of claims 1 and 9. Applicants submit that there are two
separate error signals which are distinctly and particularly claimed. Claims 1 and 9 each claim an
error signal and a differential error signal. The signals are distinctly, particularly and consistently
claimed accordingly throughout the pending claims. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1,
20 claims 2-8 depending therefrom, claim 9, and claims 10-16 depending therefrom are in allowable
form.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims are definite and do

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Thus, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in allowable form, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,274 (Rajagopalan), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-16 are in condition for allowance in their present form.

Rajagopalan, et al., issued on October 24, 2000 and was filed on February 2, 2000, and claims no priority to any other applications. Thus, Rajagopalan has an effective reference date of February 2, 2000. The present application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/151,982, filed September 1, 1999 (see page 1, lines 1-2 of the present specification). Thus, the present application predates the filing/effective date of Rajagopalan and thus renders Rajagopalan ineffective as a reference. Rajagopalan does not qualify as prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-16 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and respectfully request same.

Claims 4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,274 (Rajagopalan). This rejection again applies Rajagopalan, which does not qualify as prior art for the reasons stated above in regard to claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-16. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 13 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and respectfully request same.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in allowable form. Furthermore, Applicant submits that no combination of the cited references teach,

disclose, or suggest the subject matter of the pending claims. The pending claims are therefore in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.


In the event Applicant has overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicant hereby conditionally
5 petition therefore and authorize that any changes be made to Deposit Account No. 10-0223, JAECKLE FLEISCHMANN & MUGEL, LLP.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned in regard to this Amendment and the above identified application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

3/20/2001

✓ 

Laurence S. Roach
Reg. No. 45,044

Jaeckle Fleischmann & Mugel, LLP
39 State Street, Suite 200
Rochester, New York 14614-1310
(716) 262-3640 - Telephone
(716) 262-4133 - Facsimile